

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-20 are presently pending in this application. Claims 1 and 4 have been amended to more particularly define the claimed invention. Claims 6-20 have been added to claim additional features of the claimed invention.

It is noted that the amendments are made only to more particularly define the invention and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, for narrowing the scope of the claims, or for any reason related to a statutory requirement for patentability. It is further noted that, notwithstanding any claim amendments made herein, Applicant's intent is to encompass equivalents of all claim elements, even if amended herein or later during prosecution.

The Title is objected to and Applicant has amended the Title to be fully responsive to all points raised by the Examiner.

Claim 1 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527.

Claims 2-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527, further in view of Serravalle, Jr., U.S. Pat. No. 4,631,525.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in view of the following discussion.

**I. APPLICANT'S CLAIMED INVENTION**

The claimed invention (as defined, for example, by independent claim 1) is directed to an electronic equipment including, a display device configured to display information and including a display surface, a touch sensor arranged on at least a part of the display surface, a guide portion configured to protrude from a surface of the touch sensor and to fringe the

surface with a line including one of a concave portion and a convex portion as a vertex configured as a reference position, and a controller configured to control an adjustment value in accordance with a direction of a slide operation from the reference position.

Conventionally, in tactile display input devices, a problem exists that a reference position of an operation for specifying a reference value for increasing or decreasing that amount of an adjustment value controlled by depression of the touch sensor from a present value cannot be identified. A direction in which the touch switch part is traced can be detected, but the amount of change in increase or decrease from the reference value can not be set, nor can the amount of change in increase or decrease from the reference value could be set. (Specification at page 2, line 15 to page 3, line 8.)

The claimed invention (e.g., as recited in claim 1), on the other hand, includes *a touch sensor arranged on at least a part of the display surface*. This feature is important for easily setting the amount of change in increase or decrease from a reference value with respect to an adjustment value controlled by depression of a touch sensor on the display surface.

(Specification at page 3, lines 11-15.)

## II. THE ALLEGED PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

### A. 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Rejection over Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527

The Examiner alleges that Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527, (Dubrus), teaches the invention of claim 1.

Applicant submits, however, that Dubrus does not teach or suggest, “*a touch sensor arranged on at least a part of the display surface*.”

Dubrus teaches a flat rectangular viewing screen 9 and a dialogue device 10 disposed

around the screen 9 respectively along the right and left end sides and the top and lower edges of the screen at 9, (column 3, lines 21-26), wherein the dialogue device 10 includes, a first proximity detection band 46 with a double operating mode extending along the right-hand edge of the screen 9 and divided into 11 switching segments 21 to 31, (column 3, lines 36-40).

Dubrus fails to teach or suggest the first proximity detection band 46 *arranged on at least part of the display surface* viewing screen 9, since Dubrus clearly illustrates in figure 1, and in the above cited passages, that the first proximity detection band 46 is disposed around the screen 9, and not arranged on the viewing screen 9.

Furthermore, Debrus fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature that, *“a guide portion configured...as a reference position, and controller configured to control an adjustment value in accordance with a direction of a slide operation from the reference position.”* Debrus discloses a guide portion including a concave and a convex portion, however, Dubrus fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature that a portion of a guide portion is configured as a reference position to adjust a value in accordance with the slide operation from the reference position.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant's claimed invention.

**B. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection over Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527 in view of Serravalle, Jr., U.S. Pat. No. 4,631,525**

The Examiner alleges that Dubrus et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,598,527, (Dubrus), in view of Serravalle, Jr., U.S. Pat. No. 4,631,525, (Serravalle), teaches the invention of claims 2-5.

Applicant submits, however, that Dubrus in view of Serravalle does not teach or suggest, *“a touch sensor arranged on at least a part of the display surface.”*

Serravalle teaches a touch a-sensitive strip 16 adjacent to a display 18 which comprises an array of light elements 20. (Column 5, lines 3-5.)

With respect to the rejection of Applicant’s claims 2-5, Applicant submits that Serravalle would not have been combined with Dubrus and even if combined, the combination would not teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention since Dubrus, as pointed out above, fails to teach or suggest, *“a touch sensor arranged on at least a part of the display surface,”* and Serravalle fails to overcome the deficiencies of Dubrus.

Furthermore, Serravalle fails to disclose or suggest the claimed feature that, *“a guide portion configured...as a reference position, and controller configured to control an adjustment value in accordance with a direction of a slide operation from the reference position.”* Serravalle fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature that a portion of a guide portion is configured as a reference position to adjust a value in accordance with the slide operation from the reference position.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection since the alleged prior art reference fails to teach or suggest each and every element and feature of Applicant’s claimed invention.

**C. Newly Added Independent Claims 11 and 20 with Respect to the Applied Prior Art References**

With respect to Applicant’s newly added independent claims 11 and 20, the applied prior art references or any combination thereof fail to teach or suggest, *“receiving a contact*

*input on said surface of said touch sensor adjacent to said reference position based on guiding said finger along said guide portion to said reference position,*” of independent claim 11, and, “*touch sensor means arranged on at least a part of said display surface means,*” of independent claim 20.

Therefore, none of the cited prior art references nor any alleged combination thereof teaches or suggests each and every element of Applicant’s claimed invention with respect to newly added claims 11-20.

### III. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-20, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

May 18, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,

Donald J. Lecher

Donald J. Lecher, Esq.  
Reg. No. 41,933  
Sean M. McGinn, Esq.  
Reg. No. 34,386

**McGinn Intellectual Property Law Group, PLLC**  
8321 Old Courthouse Rd., Suite 200  
Vienna, Virginia 22182  
(703) 761-4100  
**Customer No. 21254**